

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action dated May 21, 2007, the Examiner asserted that the claims are directed to more than one species of the generic invention and that these species lack unity of invention because they are not linked to form a single general inventive concept. PCT Rule 13.1. The Examiner identified the species as follows:

- Species 1): causing a reduction in clearance by speed variances (claims 3-6, 35);
- Species 2): causing a reduction in clearance by coolant flow rate monitoring (claims 7, 34);
- Species 3): causing a reduction in clearance by increasing a flow rate (claims 8, 10-14, 33, 36-39);
- Species 4): inputting signals to an algorithm (claims 21-23, 26-28);
- Species 5): monitoring the motor current (claims 9, 32); and
- Species 6): specific signal analysis (claims 18-20).

The Examiner further asserted that claims 1-2, 15-17, 24-25, 31 and 40-41 are generic.

Applicants traverse the Examiner's unity of invention objection and seek favorable reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's characterization of claims 26-28 as inputting signals to an algorithm is erroneous. Claims 26-28 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 or dependent 17, neither of which claim an algorithm. The Examiner has read in the "algorithm" limitation to dependent claims 26-28. Applicants respectfully submit that, similar to independent claim 1 and dependent claim 17 dependent claims 26-28 are also generic. Indeed, dependent claims 26-28, like generic dependent claims 24-25, simply provide an operation relating to the analyzing step. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the characterization of claims 26-28 as species and that the claims be characterized as generic.

In addition, Applicants have withdrawn claims 7-14, 18-22, 29-30, 32-34 and 36-39 in view of the species restriction. Applicants acknowledge that "[o]nce a generic claim is allowable, all of the claims drawn to species in addition to the elected species which require all the limitations of the generic claim will ordinarily be allowable over the prior art..." MPEP § 806.04(d).

As required, Applicants have elected Species 1 corresponding to claims 3-6 and 35. Applicants also request withdrawal of the species restriction of dependent claims 26-28 and that

Serial No. 10/535,390  
Atty Dkt. M02B151

Response to May 21, 2007  
Unity of Invention Objection

these claims be characterized as generic. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that prosecution proceed on claims 1-6, 15-17, 24-28, 31, 35 and 40-41.

Respectfully submitted,



BOC Edwards, Inc.  
55 Madison Avenue, Suite 400  
Morristown, NJ 07960  
Phone: 973-285-3309  
Fax: 973-285-3320

Mary K. Nicholes  
Registration No. 56,238  
Agent for Applicant(s)  
Date: Jul. 20, 2007

Customer No. 71134